THE

MONTHLY JOURNAL.

Vol. V.] BOSTON, OCTOBER, 1864. [No. 10.

EVERLASTING PUNISHMENT.

In our August number, we noticed a declaration, signed by the bishops of the Episcopal Church, in which they say that the Church of England believes that the whole Bible is the word of God in the literal sense; and also that the Church of England believes that the punishment of the wicked, like the bliss of the righteous, is everlasting.

We remarked in that article, that the reason why the bishops in the United States should indorse the orthodoxy of the Church of England did not at first appear. One would think that the Church of England could take care of its own orthodoxy; but we suppose, that, as the Episcopal Church in America derives from the Church of England, it feels a little sensitive when such books as "Essays and Reviews," or as Bishop Colenso's Works, are published there. Part of the disgrace of free thinking comes on itself. Therefore the bishops issue this declaration, which is intended as an additional Article, added to the Thirty-nine, to keep up the orthodoxy of the Mother Church, and so also to strengthen a little that of the daughter.

But we wish now to say something in addition to what we said in our August number respecting the doctrine of everlasting punishment. This doctrine is, we think, de-

rived from Paganism, and has nothing to do with Christianity, except to corrupt it. No man was ever made better by believing it: multitudes have been made worse. It attributes to our heavenly Father conduct, that, if done by the worst of men, would add a shade of increased wickedness to their character. It assumes that God has made intelligent creatures with the intention of tormenting some of them for ever. It assumes that those who are thus created, exposed to this awful risk, are to be thus tormented, unless they happen to pass through what is called an Orthodox conversion in this short earthly life. God keeps them alive for ever in order to torture them for ever.

The barbarity of this opinion exceeds all power of language to express. We are accustomed to mourn over the anguish and misery that are in this world. The problem of earthly evil has been a burden and anxiety to good men in all times, a great question for thinkers in all ages. The only satisfactory solution is, that it is temporary and educational; that it is to pass away, and, in passing, to create a higher joy and goodness than could otherwise have come. But the doctrine of everlasting punishment not only annuls this explanation, and makes it impossible to explain earthly evil, but adds to it a tenfold greater mystery. The fatherly character of God disappears in Pagan darkness, in view of this horrid doctrine; for the everlasting suffering of one human being contains in itself more evil than the accumulated sufferings of all mankind from the creation of the world to the end of it. Add together all the sicknesses, bereavements, disappointments, of all mankind; all the wars, famines, pestilences, that have tormented humanity; add to these all the mental and moral pangs produced by selfishness and sin in all ages, and all that are to be to the end of time, — and these all

combined are logically and mathematically *nothing*, compared with the sufferings of one human being destined to be everlastingly punished. For all temporal sufferings added together are finite; but this is infinite.

Now, the being who could inflict such torture as this is *not* the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. There may be some deity of cruelty, some incarnation of wrath and despotism, in the Hindoo Pantheon, capable of such terrific wickedness. It is no answer to say that God inflicts suffering now in this world, and therefore he may inflict everlasting suffering in the other: for these are all finite; that is infinite. *Finite* suffering may result in greater good, may be an education to good; but *everlasting* suffering cannot. The finite and infinite cannot be compared together. There is no analogy between them.

The God of the New Testament is our Father. If he inflicts suffering, it is for our good; "not for his pleasure, but for our profit, that we may be partakers of his holiness." All earthly suffering finds this solution, and accords with the fatherly character of God, in this point of view. Much, no doubt, cannot be now fully understood. We do not *see how* it tends to good; but all suffering *that ends* MAY end in good. Suffering that does not end CANNOT end in good.

If human beings are everlastingly punished, it must either be that they go on sinning for ever, and cannot repent, lose all power of repentance, and so cease to be moral agents; or else that they retain the power of repenting, and therefore *may* repent. In the first case, God continues to punish for ever those who have ceased to sin, because their freedom and moral power has ceased; or else he punishes for ever those who have repented, and so ceased sinning. In either case, God must punish everlastingly those who have ceased to be sinners; which is incredible.

Now, this doctrine, being a Heathen and not a Christian doctrine, cannot do any Christian good to any one. It is the want of faith in the Church which makes them afraid of giving it up. The Christian Church has not faith enough to believe in the power of truth and love. It still thinks that men must be frightened into goodness, or driven into it. Well, fear is a becoming and useful motive, I grant, no less than hope; but fear of what? Not fear of God, but fear of sin, fear of ourselves, fear of temptation. To be afraid of God never did any one any good. These doctrines drive men away from God; or, if they drive them *to* God, drive them as slaves, as sycophants, as servants, not as sons. We are saved by becoming *the sons of God;* but you cannot drive a man into sonship by terror. You may make him profess religion, and go through ceremonies, and have an outward form of service; but you cannot make him love God by means of fear.

But good men teach these things, no doubt. Men far better than most of us believe them and teach them. It always has been so. The best men have always been the chief supporters of bad doctrines. A good man, humble and modest, is apt to shrink from doubting or opposing what the Church has taught. He accepts it, and teaches it too. When God wants a reformer, he does not take one of these good, modest, humble men. He does not take a saint. He takes a man who has ever so much will, a little obstinacy, and a great love of fighting; and he makes the wrath of such a man to serve him. Neither St. Teresa nor Fénélon could have reformed the Catholic Church. It took rough old Martin Luther and hard-hearted John Calvin to do it. The Universalists, the Abolitionists, all reformers, are necessarily men of that sort. They are rude debaters, not standing on ceremony or politeness.

They are hard-headed logicians; going straight to their point, careless of elegances and proprieties. They are God's pioneers, rough backwoodsmen, hewing their way with the axe through the wilderness. After them shall come the peaceful farmer, with plough and spade, to turn the land into wheat-fields, orchards, and gardens.

The Christianity of Christ, planted in the midst of Paganism and Judaism, took up into itself much of both. It Paganized and Judaized. Christ predicted this, predicted both wheat and tares, and said that both should grow together till the harvest. The Church has to-day a great deal of Paganism and Judaism still in it, all baptized under the same fair name of Christianity. The Church still holds to the Jewish sabbath, to the Jewish priesthood and synagogue, to the Jewish doctrine of sacrifices. It holds to Pagan views of God and man. It despises and enslaves man, according to Pagan ideas of human nature. It looks on God as wilful, as capricious, as despotic, according to the Pagan notion of Deity. These are the tares which have grown up with the wheat. Once in a while comes a harvest, when God sends his angels to separate the tares from the wheat, — a day of judgment to sift truths from errors. The Reformation of Luther was such a harvest and judgment-day: the present time is, I think, another.

"But," you may say, "does not Jesus teach this doctrine of everlasting punishment, as the bishops say he does?" No: Jesus does not teach it. He does *not* say, "These shall go away into *everlasting* punishment." The same word is used in both parts of the verse; the word rightly translated, in one instance, "eternal." "These go into *eternal* life:" "these go into *eternal* death or suffering."

But "eternal" and "everlasting" are two wholly different ideas. I believe fully in *eternal punishment;* but I do not believe it *everlasting.* Eternal punishment and eternal

life have nothing to do with *duration*. The idea of *time* does not enter into either. *Eternity* excludes the idea of time. Eternity belongs to an entirely different order of ideas. Eternity no more contains the notion of duration, than justice, love, faith, hope, contain the notion of duration. The "eternal" is the same as the "spiritual." Eternal life is spiritual life: eternal suffering is spiritual suffering.

The whole of antiquity recognizes this distinction; and the Bible is saturated with it. When Jesus says, "He who believes in me has *eternal life* abiding in him," there is nothing about duration intended in that. When he says, "This is *life eternal*, to know thee the only true God," there is nothing about duration implied. It is the quality of the life which is conveyed, — spiritual life, life flowing from the sight of God and Christ.

I believe in eternal punishment; but, because it is eternal, therefore it is not everlasting. Eternal suffering, flowing from the sight of the eternal truth and love of God, is real suffering, because it involves the sight of sin, the consciousness of failure, the deep conviction of what we ought to do and have not done; but all this leads to repentance and salvation. When the Lord turned, and looked on Peter, Peter went into eternal suffering. He saw his own guilt and the infinite goodness of his Master at the same time. The one produced penitence; the other, hope. But, when Judas hanged himself, he did *not* go into eternal punishment, but into temporal. He saw his own baseness and his own folly; but he did not see God's love. If he had seen God's love and Christ's pardoning mercy, together with his sin, he would not have hanged himself; but, like Peter, he would have repented, and gone forth to preach the gospel.

When we see God's truth and love, we go into eternal

life or into eternal suffering, according to the direction of our lives and hearts. If we are following Christ, and trying to do right; if we are not selfish, but generous, — then the sight of God's love and truth in Christ leads us directly into spiritual joy: but if we are selfish, and seeking only our own good; if we are indifferent to the rights of our fellow-men, — then we go into eternal or spiritual suffering. This is what Jesus teaches. He teaches that those who never knew him, never heard of him, but who are doing good to their fellow-men, will go into life eternal. The Heathen who are hospitable and kind, like those whom Mr. Malcom saw in Burmah, like those whom Bruce met in Abyssinia, like those whom Livingston describes in South Africa, — Christ will say to them, "Ye did it to me." The sceptic, deist, man of the world; the poor child of sin and shame in Ann Street or the Five Points; border ruffians, who never had any teaching or good influence, but who have some human kindness left, some pity for those who suffer, some effort to help those lower than themselves, — these shall hear Christ's voice, "Come, ye blessed of my Father, — come into my kingdom. You belong there. You have been serving me and helping me, without knowing it. Come now, and sit with me in my realm of love and truth."

LETTER TO A LAYMAN.

DEAR ——,

Coming home from the deeply interesting installation services at P——, my eyes had a feast in looking at sunset glories, with exquisite reflections of hills and trees in the mirroring river for dessert; but as the twilight deepened, and Nature, like other proprietors of fine faces, let down

her veil as a hint for curious eyes to gaze elsewhere, I turned my back to the car-window, and surrendered my self to meditation on the events of the day.

The first thought was of the pleasure given by the sight of your active interest in this ecclesiastical occasion. It assured me, that, with all your love of independence and freedom, you are neither above nor below caring for those institutions which your parents considered most precious and sacred, but which many men of your education and influence find it easy to slight and avoid. Believing that you do not intend to look back after putting your hand to the church-plough which you directed so gracefully to-day, and relying upon the generous forbearance of an old class-mate, let me now give you a few suggestions relating to the welfare of your parish. Probably some of them will have occurred to you already; but others are not likely to be familiar to any one who has not borne in his own person many of the burdens of the work of the ministry.

The correspondence laid before the council was the best of the kind that I have ever seen or heard. Was I wrong in fancying that I detected your pen in the manly and cordial letter which assured Brother L. of the earnest wish of the people that he should become their pastor? Pardon me, however, for adding, that his reply was even better in thought and expression. Such sentences could not have been written by a shallow or trifling man. They attested his fitness for his calling far better than the results of the most thorough catechising could have done. If you saw the faces of our ministers as they gave earnest heed to this correspondence, you could not have failed to mark the almost reverential sympathy with which they received such a modest and eloquent statement of the noblest purposes.

There was but one drawback from my satisfaction; and that was occasioned by noting that the salary is no larger

than it was in times of peace. Is it possible that your people are not aware of the vaulting ambition of beef, and the lofty aspirations of butter? Can it be that you have forgotten that gold is nearly 2.50? Something or other must be the matter with your memories. If the salary was barely sufficient in ordinary times, how can it hold out when only three pounds of good white sugar are to be had for a dollar, and carpets which were once rather dear at ninety-five cents now sell for two dollars and seventy-five cents? The truth is, that your thousand dollars involves no less straining and pinching on the part of your minister than he would have experienced five years ago if you had limited him to four or five hundred. At a recent festival, I saw you rubbing your hands in cruel glee when a gifted young clergyman was laying his gold-mounted rhetorical whip over the shoulders of what he styled his underworked and overpaid profession; but such notions, however funny to him and to you, are not so jolly to those of us who have had no millionnaires for ancestors, and no heiresses for wives. In every denomination, there are clergymen whose reputations are sullied by inability to pay their debts. While I regard such conduct as inexcusable and blameworthy in a minister of the gospel, whose plain and imperative duty it is to provide things honest in the sight of all men, owing no man any thing, there is a very slight palliation for the indebtedness of those who must emulate the rigid self-denial of many of their brethren, if they would not be bankrupts.

If you wish to be really useful, there is no better sphere than in making the members of your society understand that the obligation of contracts implies, that, whenever L. preaches, they should be present to listen. Please to employ some of your legal lore in making it clear to the dullest of them that the bargain is, not that he shall preach to the

walls of the church-edifice, but to animated beings, supposed to have a soul apiece, however deficient in other personal property. It is for the congregation to decide whether they wish to have one or two sermons a day; but be sure to expose the meanness of *saying* that you desire two, and *acting* as if you cared for only one. If none but the cheerful attendants of the second service were understood to be in favor of the usage, it would be continued or discontinued, according to the truth. In the large family of pious frauds, there are few worse deceptions than that of promising a congregation, and not fulfilling the engagement. It is one of the most fruitful sources of dulness in the pulpit. So long as means are to be adapted to ends, there can be nothing more appropriate than the preparation of a wooden sermon to be addressed to nothing but pews.

Try to make the people feel, that, when they are at church, it is best to be wakeful in appearance as well as in reality, keeping their eyes open, and their faces turned towards the pulpit; for these are conditions of spirited preaching. More than once, it has been my "privilege" to address audiences who seemed as eyeless as any fish in the Mammoth Cave. Sometimes, indeed, the absence of all signs of life has become so oppressive at the very beginning of my discourse, that I have almost felt it my duty to stop after reading the text, and to send at once for a coroner. Many a live preacher has been killed by a dead congregation.

Allow L. to stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ has made him free. He is so little of a dictator, that it will be a most gratuitous insult if you seek to hear the clank of chains when he ascends your pulpit-stairs, and to see the marks of your manacles whenever he stretches forth his arms from "the sacred desk." I have no fear that *you* will be an actor in any persecutions for righteousness' sake; but

do not permit others to do what you would scorn to do yourself. It is a common thing for a few mischievous and determined men to lord it over a large parish of easy and peace-loving people, to the everlasting disgrace of the latter. Where the people have the least self-respect, a very different result will be observed. A signal instance of this often enters my mind. There is a town in New England, noted for historical associations with certain high land which once formed a portion of its territory; yet the truest "heights" of the place are its moral and spiritual elevations. There, if anywhere in the country, the great battle for free speech in the ministry has been fairly fought, and completely won. It is owing to an heroic laity, no less than to a faithful clergyman, that the next generation may well inscribe on the walls of that true church, in letters of gold, "Here the freedom of the pulpit was once manfully claimed, and as manfully was it allowed."

It gave me great satisfaction to hear you say this morning that you were tired of new faces in the pulpit, and you were glad to have a pastor once more. In this relation, also, you can render important services to the church by diffusing among the people right ideas about the work that L. has undertaken in your behalf. The installation exercises have warmed their hearts towards him, and at least a hundred doors are opened for "our minister" to enter. In due time, he will go the rounds; but there must be patience with him. Although many persons seem to think that it is easy to be everywhere at once, omnipresence is *not* a clerical attribute.

When L. appears at your firesides, he will not bring gloom, but joy, to you. Few can surpass him in genial talk and radiant smiles. But do not forget that his mission is not fulfilled when he has been merely your welcome and pleasing companion: he has spiritual purposes, religious

aims; and, if you do not resolutely bar his way, there will be times when the conversation will take both deep and lofty turns. In this most delicate office, do not fail to appreciate his object and to promote it.

"I stand at the door, and knock," is a good motto for a Christian pastor; but many err in either the excess or lack of directness. Some try to enter hearts without knocking; and the first thing that a parishioner knows is, that his minister has invaded the most sacred privacies of the soul with some such abrupt question as, "Do you know the Lord?" Every man's soul is his spiritual castle, which no priest has a right to enter without requesting and obtaining permission. I have full sympathy with the indignation of young persons who resent this too-common violation of the sanctuaries of their nature. As your society is Unitarian, and L. is a gentleman, you need not fear any thing like this. But our denomination goes too far in the way of reticence. The most of our ministers stand at the door of human hearts without knocking, and therefore it is very seldom that they get in. Now, L. is modest "to a fault;" and still he is too much in earnest to let the years go by with merely trivial intercourse between his people and himself. Gently, and yet firmly, he will ask to enter into your confidences; and, knowing that he can be trusted, I hope you will see to it that the holiest of all hospitalities is not denied to him. Acquainted with your needs, his prayers and sermons will be enriched with a reality which no vague guessing about the spiritual condition of his charge will ever enable him to obtain.

Once more, I commend L. and his work to your appreciation, sympathy, and co-operation. These are great days for professions of loyalty to the powers of earth: let there be equal alacrity in taking the oath of allegiance to the heavenly Ruler. You made allowable boasts of the

promptitude with which your town has filled its quota of troops, responding to every call of the President: let the calls of the Saviour be equally honored. L. is a recruiting officer for the army of the Lord: he uplifts a more sacred symbol than the flag; and that is the cross. Do not discourage him because his only bounties are the promises of the gospel, and his term of service is for eternity. In Sunday school and church, let your quota be filled to overflowing with volunteers, — the only soldiers who are worthy of such a leader and such a cause. *

"THE ALLOTROPIC TRINITY."

LETTER FROM MR. HUNTINGTON TO THE "MONTHLY JOURNAL."

[In our notice of Mr. Huntington's pamphlet, we offered to print any reply, reasonable in length and character, which he might wish to make. Mr. Huntington has sent us the following letter, which we print with a few notes. — EDITOR.]

MR. EDITOR, — My attention has been called to an article in your "Journal" for the current month, with the above heading. In this article, you review at some length a recent tract of mine, entitled "The Mystery of the Trinity paralleled in Nature." In the concluding paragraph, I find these words: "In case the writer thinks that our criticism is open to objections, we shall be very happy to give him the use of our pages, to a reasonable extent, to explain himself further." I have no taste for theological controversy; and should not avail myself of the liberty thus kindly given me, were it not that silence would seem to argue either a certain acquiescence in the results of your criticism, or else a rude disregard of your courtesy. Neither of these inferences can I willingly sanction. I

shall therefore put into as few words as possible some reasons for continuing to believe my argument a sound one.

In the opening of your article, you show your full appreciation of the functions and value of analogical reasoning; for you admit, cordially and without reserve, that, in case the analogy under consideration can be proved to be without flaw, all argument against the reasonableness of the doctrine of the Trinity falls to the ground (p. 351). This clears the air wonderfully, and discloses a common footing for us to stand upon. We agree, that, if the analogy be sound, the Orthodox doctrine must be reasonable. And now for the supposed flaws.

Your criticisms are three in number, and as follows: —

First, The analogy fails, because the same carbon cannot exist *simultaneously* in its three allotropic conditions, but can only thus exist by consecutive changes (p. 354).

Secondly, Supposing it were granted that carbon could exist in a simultaneous tri-unity: the analogy would still fail; since it would then illustrate, not the Orthodox, but the Sabellian, or modal Trinity (p. 356).

Thirdly, The pictorial illustration employed in the tract as a test for the adequacy of any proposed analogy is a failure, and nothing to the point (pp. 358–59).

I. "Mr. Huntington will not pretend that the same carbon can exist *simultaneously* in its three forms of charcoal, diamond, and graphite."

Now, this is just the point: the same carbon does exist simultaneously in its three forms. Our difference lies here. You suppose me to be speaking of a given *piece* of carbon; whereas I am really speaking of the *substance* carbon, using the word "substance" in its strict and exact

sense. It would, of course, be a palpable absurdity to say that a given fragment of graphite could be at the same time a diamond: but, in saying that the same carbon exists simultaneously in its three forms, I assert nothing that is absurd; I simply state a fact in Nature. Thus, also, if any one were to say the Father is the Son, or the Spirit is the Father, he would assert a manifest self-contradiction; but if he says Father, Son, and Spirit are simultaneously God, he does indeed affirm what is a mystery, but something very far from an absurdity. The point where we diverge is at our definition of the word "substance," — a word that has two meanings. Throughout my tract, whether in speaking chemically or theologically, I use the word in its exact sense. From the language of your criticism, I infer that you have understood me otherwise. This is no hair-splitting; for the distinction between the two senses of the word involves a real difference, and is recognized by every scholar. In its exact sense, *substance* means the unknown and mysterious something that underlies existence, whether material or spiritual. As a popular word, on the other hand, substance has come to be synonymous with matter, and conveys to most minds solely the idea of visible bulk. As an instance of the exact usage of the word, I would refer your readers to the Nicene Creed, — "being of one *substance* with the Father." Were this clause to be understood according to the popular and inexact sense of the word "substance," the grossest materialism would be involved. When, therefore, I speak of carbon as "one," or as "one substance," I mean all the pure carbon in existence. You understand me to mean some one piece of carbon. Let us simplify the question by a supposition. Supposing, — what is perfectly supposable for purposes of argument, — supposing that all the existing material universe were to be de-

stroyed, with the exception of pure carbon in its three allotropic forms: would it not then be possible, nay necessary, to assert, there is but one substance (namely, carbon), and this carbon exists at once and at the same time as charcoal, diamond, and graphite? But this, you say (p. 355), is just what the doctrine of the Trinity asserts of the Deity; namely, that God exists at once and at the same time as Father, Son, and Spirit. How, then, does it appear that the analogy in this point "utterly fails, and breaks down"? Are not the two mysteries, as mysteries, parallel? *

II. But, you urge, the analogy, even supposing it to be an analogy at all, is not applicable to the Orthodox Trinity, but only illustrates an heretical doctrine. Permit me to cite your own language: —

"The triplicity is clearly modal, — a triplicity of form or appearance. The FATHER is then one aspect or mode of divine

* Either Mr. Huntington has misapprehended our objection, or we misapprehend his reply. The metaphysical definition of "substance" has nothing to do with our argument.

According to Mr. Huntington's last supposition, if all the material universe was destroyed, except pure carbon in its three allotropic forms, then we might say, "*One part* of the material universe is carbon as graphite; *another part*, carbon as diamond; and a *third part* is carbon as charcoal." But we cannot say of the Deity (according to the Orthodox Trinity), "*One part* of the Deity is God as Father, *another part* of the Deity is God as Son, and another part is God as Holy Ghost;" for while it is one part of the carbon which is graphite, and another part which is diamond, it is *not* one part of Deity which is the Father, and another part Holy Ghost. When our friend asserts that "the *same* carbon exists simultaneously in its three forms," he does not mean *same*, but *similar*. He means that the portion of carbon underlying graphite is exactly similar to the portion of carbon which underlies diamond. He uses "same substance" as we use "same humanity," when we say, "The same humanity was in Napoléon Bonaparte and in George Washington;" meaning that the original elements of manhood were alike in the two.

action; the SON, another; the HOLY SPIRIT, a third. Each is truly God. God is seen, *but not wholly seen*, in each. He who only sees diamond, sees indeed carbon in its reality, but does not see carbon in its total character. He does not know carbon fully till he has seen it also as graphite and charcoal. So he who sees Deity only as the Father, or only as the Son, does not know God as he ought to know him. He has seen him in one of his forms or manifestations; but he must see him in all in order to know him wholly.

"According to this analogy, therefore, each of the three persons is *really* God, but not *fully* God, without the others. This may be, and we believe is, a truer doctrine of the Trinity than the Church doctrine; but it is *not* the Church doctrine, nor is it Orthodoxy. It is not Orthodoxy, because it makes each of the divine persons imperfect without the others. But that which is imperfect is not God; consequently, neither the Father, the Son, nor the Spirit, is truly God. Each has something wanting to the others; but that something must be something divine, since it belongs to a divine person. Consequently, each of the other persons is wanting in this divine quality; is therefore imperfectly divine; is therefore *not* God."

These two paragraphs are by far the most significant in your review. They contain (*a*) a definition of Sabellianism; (*b*) a condensed argument to prove that the doctrine of the tract stultifies itself, by holding a divine person to be at once perfect and imperfect; (*c*) an avowal, on your part, of belief in some Trinity, provided it be not the "Church," not the "Orthodox" Trinity.

a. The analogy is made out to be Sabellian, because it teaches, that, although God can be truly known in one of his personalities, he cannot thus be fully known. I confess I scarcely know how to answer this. To me, the doctrine that the Almighty cannot be *fully* known by any created intelligence, but can be *truly* known through the person of his incarnate Son, so far from being Sabellianism or any

other *ism*, has always seemed the very pith and marrow of our religion. I cannot agree with you that he only "knows God as he ought to know him," who is able "to know him wholly." If we could know him wholly, we should be Gods ourselves.* The man who knows the mind and heart of Christ knows God as he ought to know him. Even the philosophy of unbelief has come reluctantly to acknowledge one half of this great truth; † but never can Philosophy be rightly called divine till she cheerfully acknowledges the other half as well, — the possibilities as well as the impossibilities of faith. I therefore admit that my tract teaches that Deity is not known in its total character in any one of the three personalities; but I deny that this is Sabellianism.

b. Further, you allege that the doctrine of the tract makes each of the divine persons imperfect without the other; for which reason, no one of them can be truly God. From this also I am obliged to dissent. A necessary condition of existence does not involve imperfection. Charcoal, as charcoal, is not imperfect because it is not graphite. Graphite is not imperfect, as graphite, because it is not diamond. The difficulty with your argument is, that, if it proves any thing, it proves too much.‡ It is a sword that

* When we say "wholly seen," we do not, of course, mean that the finite mind can comprehend the Infinite, but only the manifestations of the Infinite. If God has revealed himself to us in Nature as Law, Order, and Beauty, and has revealed himself to us in Scripture as Father and Saviour, then we cannot wholly know God by merely going to Nature or by merely going to Scripture; but we *can* wholly know him (that is, wholly know all that is to be known of him) if we go to both sources.

† See Herbert Spencer on Ultimate Religious Ideas, *First Principles*, chap. ii.

‡ A *finite* being, or existence, is not imperfect as a finite being for not having the qualities of another finite being; but an infinite person, like each of the supposed persons of the Trinity, ceases to be infinite if

cuts both ways, and has been used, as you are aware, by the Positivists to damage the argument for simple Deism. Against a personal God, for instance, the syllogism runs thus: The Infinite must include the finite, or else it is "imperfect." God is the Infinite; man is the finite: *ergo* God includes man. Against a holy God, the reasoning is of the same sort. God must have all possible qualities,

---

any divine quality or perfection is wanting to him. Now, if the Father is a divine person, and the Son is a divine person different from the Father, that which distinguishes the Father from the Son must be some quality in the one which is not in the other. This quality, since it qualifies a divine person, must be a divine quality or a perfection. There is then a divine perfection in the Father which is not in the Son, and *vice versâ*. Consequently, each, being deficient in a divine perfection, becomes imperfect. This logic seems to us unanswerable, because depending upon the idea of the Trinity, and not upon its words. It is no answer to say that it would prove diamond imperfect; for diamond is not asserted to contain all perfections, as God is asserted to contain them. Diamond is finite, and limited by the definition; God, infinite and absolute by the definition.

The argument against Deism, again, is different, and easily answered. "The Infinite must include the finite, or it is imperfect." We answer, No: the finite, as such, is not a perfection, but an imperfection, a limitation. To say that "the Infinite must include the finite, in order to be perfect," is to say that it must be imperfect in order to be perfect; which is an absurdity. But God does include the finite, and also includes man, so far as he is "above all, and through all, and in all," and so far as "all things" are "from him, and through him, and to him."

So, too, of the other argument against a holy God. The fallacy lies in the assertion, that "God must have all possible *qualities* in order to be perfect." Not "all possible qualities," but "all possible perfections." Evil is not a perfection, but an imperfection.

The basis of my argument is, that "a divine person must possess all possible perfections." On that basis, I show that the Church doctrine of the Trinity cannot make either of its three persons divine. It is no answer to say that a *different* position from this will overthrow Theism. It is *my* position which must be assailed, not some other. "X^2" is not imperfect as X^2 because not X^3; but if we should assert that X^2 was a *divine person*, and yet that X^3 had *divine perfections* not belonging to X^2, I think we should find ourselves in an illogical position.

else he is "imperfect." There are evil qualities as well as good ones: consequently, God must possess evil qualities; consequently, he is not holy. Thus the very logic that is employed to prove the unreason of Orthodoxy springs a mine under the foundations of all Christian faith whatever. The fallacy lies, as was just remarked, in assuming that a necessary condition of existence involves imperfection.*

c. If one doctrine of the Trinity can be truer than another, it follows, of course, that some doctrine of the Trinity must be absolutely true.† You say, "This may be, and we believe is, a truer doctrine of the Trinity than the Church doctrine." The question arises, what this true doctrine can be, if it be other than the catholic doctrine that has been held by the vast majority of believers from the first.

In the more recent phases of the controversy in which I have become an unwilling participant, it has been not infrequent for the Unitarian critic to assume that what his author says may be all very well, only it is not Orthodoxy: it is not the pure, genuine article it was meant to be. The opponents of Orthodoxy thus become the instructors of the

---

* Ask the mathematician whether X^2 is "imperfect" because there is such a thing as X^3.

† By no means. The system of homœopathy may be a truer system of medicine than the system of allopathy, and yet there may be *no* system of medicine absolutely true.

Mr. Huntington wishes to know what we mean by saying that such and such doctrines of the Trinity are not Orthodox and are not the Church doctrine. He also seems to think, that, as heretics, we have no right to instruct the Orthodox about Orthodoxy. Certainly not; but, as heretics, we have naturally been led to study the history of opinion concerning this doctrine, and have a right to object to a man's claiming to be Orthodox, while holding what the great majority has long ago decided to be a heresy. If he brings forward Sabellianism, and defends it as Orthodoxy, we have a right to say, "No: that is Sabellianism."

Orthodox; and, by those who repudiate Orthodoxy, Orthodoxy is authoritatively defined. Now, let us understand one another. You say the doctrine of the tract is not the Church doctrine. I venture to think that it is. What shall decide? Evidently, an appeal to the standards. What are these standards in my case? As a Churchman, in the broadest sense of the word, I am bound by the primitive creeds, — the so-called Apostles' and the Nicene. As a clergyman of the Protestant Episcopal Church, I am further bound by the articles and liturgy of my own communion as contained in the Book of Common Prayer. To these standards I appeal; and, if you can show any thing in any of them that militates against the doctrine of the tract, I will gladly own that doctrine heretical.

It is very possible, that, in the writings of eminent Trinitarians, you may find statements irreconcilable with the language I have used; but I insist that I am no more bound by these individual opinions than a citizen is bound by the judgment of a private lawyer, however eminent, on a question of constitutional law. The doctrinal language of my tract was this: —

In the Unity of the Godhead there are three persons, each eternal, each divine, — Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; and yet there are not three Gods, but one God.

With this statement, I believe, the language of the Common Prayer perfectly harmonizes; and, to the apparent logical difficulty involved in it, I believe the facts of allotropism offer an exact parallel.

III. The objection you make to the diagram or symbol employed in the tract is one that was suggested by a friend before the manuscript went to the printer. It is an objection easily removed. In a foot-note, which you are good enough to reprint (p. 353), I tried to guard the reader

against just this misconception, by reminding him that *all* the requirements of the symbol must be kept in mind in order to make it useful as a test. The symbol is an ancient one, familiar, no doubt, to many of your readers. At the centre of a triangle, the name of the Deity is written; at the angles, the names of the three personalities. On lines running from the angles to the centre, you write the word "is;" on the lines that form the sides of the triangle, the words "is not." Now, I re-assert that any analogy that fulfils *all* the requirements of this symbol is a true one. Carbon, with its one substance and three personalities, does this. The illustrations you adduce fail to do so. You propose to write "a man" at the centre, and "Peter, James, and John" at the angles; but one of the requirements of the symbol is that the name of one substance shall be written at the centre. "A man" is not one substance, but is merely the name of an individual of a genus.* Again: you propose to write "sound" at the centre; and "speech," "music," and "thunder" at the angles. This also violates the conditions of the symbol. Speech and music are undoubtedly sound; but they are sound modified and limited in a manner we can define and describe. Speech is sound resulting from the action of the human throat; music is a general word for many kinds of sounds; and thunder is still another variety of the same thing. Therefore I cannot admit "that each of these two illustrations exactly fulfils the conditions of the formula." †

And now the case is fairly before your readers. I can

---

* Then write MAN, instead of "a man."

† But are not "graphite" and "diamond" "modified and limited in a way we can define and describe"? Is it a condition of the formula that the three modifications of the substance must be indefinable and indescribable? We do not perceive the objection to our illustrations, or how they fail to fulfil all the requirements of the symbol.

hardly expect that my answers will seem to you any more convincing than your objections have appeared to me. Still it is not a small thing, in a controversy of this sort, to have avoided, as you, sir, certainly have done, and as I have striven to do, that bitterness of feeling and expression with which the discussion of these subjects is so often tinged.

I put forth my little pamphlet with no wish to provoke strife, but simply, as I conceived, in the interest of truth. You have recognized my peaceful intentions, and have reviewed me in a perfectly fair, straight-forward way. Each of us loves what he believes to be the truth. You regard the doctrine of the Trinity as nothing more than a metaphysical formula. I regard it as the shield and bulwark of a truth upon which the very life of Christendom depends, — the truth that God and man are truly met and joined in the person of Jesus Christ our Lord. Unless I keep firm grasp upon this truth, history becomes to me a puzzle, the Bible a bewilderment, worship an impossibility, and life a sad, weary journey under impenetrable clouds.

Very respectfully yours,

W. R. HUNTINGTON.

AUG. 23, 1864.

HINDOO MISSION.

[The following letter from Brother Dall gives a pleasant picture of the work in which he is engaged. Annexed is a letter from a Hindoo, who is "feeling after God, if haply he may find him, who is not far from any one of us."]

UNITARIAN MISSION HOUSE,
CALCUTTA, July 22, 1864.

To the Chairman A. U. A. Committee for India.

DEAR BROTHER WINKLEY, — It would have pleased you, could you have looked in upon the assembly which filled our Mission House on Tuesday evening last. It was

the first time since my coming to Calcutta that my eyes have feasted on the sight of a hundred and twenty to a hundred and fifty *Christian* friends, meeting for moral and religious instruction under the shadow of our rock. You are already aware, perhaps, of the fact, that, for eight or ten months past, a kind Providence has given me a good part in a widely extended and daily extending reform in the social drinking customs of the people here, both Christian and native inhabitants of Calcutta and of Bengal.

From the day of my reaching India, in 1855, I have ceased not to teach and to preach Jesus Christ as the dispenser of temperance, righteousness, and judgment to come. There was a time, as you may remember, when sectarian opposition was very bitter against us; when it rejected me with scorn from even the lowest seat in a convention of "Bengal Protestant missionaries of all denominations;" and when placards were distributed at the church-doors, calling on faithful witnesses for Jesus to "rise up, and stop the withering, blasting breath of this agent of the Devil." We now begin to taste the sweet truth of the prophecy, "By well-doing ye shall put to silence the ignorance of foolish men." Having possessed our souls in patience, we now see the dawning of a brighter and lovelier day. A popular "Orthodox" minister, the Rev. Edward Storrow, while nowise approving or encouraging our too radical theology, came last Tuesday, and presided in our upper hall, which a goodly number of Christian neighbors of different sects, Roman Catholics included, had adorned with lilies and roses for the occasion; and where they partook together of a simple repast, before the good "padre" Storrow lifted up our hearts in united prayer to our Father. The night was beautiful, under the full moon; and no rain fell, though we are now in the heart of "the rains." There were several speakers; and, among

them, your missionary was called out to bear his full share of the "preaching." There was also assigned him for the next occasion, when we meet in the Baptist Chapel in Buhoo Bazar, a portion of the Old and of the New Testament for comment and exposition, as bearing on the repentance and redemption of the most wretched of all sinners, the inebriate; and also on the conduct of the "moderate" drinker of the cup of trembling. I speak soberly and without enthusiasm when I say that this week's rally within our walls, and festival under our roof, marks for us a higher tide of success among fellow-*Christians* in this part of the world than we have ever known. It is a sign of the times on which one, who has been as isolated as I have been these many years, cannot be blamed for looking with gratitude and hope. At the moment in which I write, there enters to inspect our school (of two hundred and forty Hindoos and Mahometans), and to "see how we go to work to Christianize them," a tall English gentleman, who first found his way to us last Tuesday night, — Capt. Ewen Mackinnon of Halifax, N.S.

I am now, from day to day, addressing our pupils (whose number yesterday increased to an attendance of two hundred and fifty) on gospel principles as detailed in number four of our eight Boston Unitarian Sunday-school manuals, entitled "Scenes from the Life of Jesus." I invite replies from all present, and the freest orderly expressions of dissent; and they are always gently, though often feelingly, given. The readiness and clearness with which a Bengali boy speaks out his thought — thinking it out "on his legs," in the face of two hundred listeners — may well be the envy of our boys at home. It seems a national peculiarity. In these our daily discussions of religious and moral truth, I acquire an insight into actual Hindoo life such as no books could give. Speaking of our Christian way of con-

ducting our temperance festival (first, by all, of both sexes, eating and drinking together as one family; and, secondly, by common prayer to our heavenly Father, &c., &c.), I "realized" as never before that common or united prayer is a thing unknown to the Hindoos (except the *Unitarian* Hindoos, the *Brahmo* Church); and that partaking of *food* in common, even among *gentlemen* Hindoos (with rare exceptions), is unknown. A majority of my voters, the other day, voted against it as destructive of the *order* of society, (caste?) and dreaded the certain ruin of the modesty of woman that must curse Bengal when Bengali *ladies* so far forget themselves as to eat and drink together on public or social occasions.

God be with us! DALL.

LANDOUR, 10th May, 1864.

To Rev. DALL, Unitarian Missionary, Calcutta.

REVEREND SIR, — I most respectfully beg to write you the following lines, and beg you will kindly excuse me for the liberty I have taken.

For a long time, I am desirous to be acquainted with the principles of Unitarianism; but, knowing none who can give me the truth of this religion, I am obliged to remain in perfect darkness up to this time. Fortunately hearing of your zeal to teach the principles of this religion to those who seek after it, I am emboldened to ask from you the same, and trust that you will kindly give me an insight into the religion. I must let you know, that, for many years, I am seeking after the truth, but sorry that I have not found it up to this time, for what I am earnestly after. Although I outwardly acknowledge Bramaism, still there are doubts which I have not yet been able to surmount. I have been blessed by the Almighty God with all that I require; but with all these I do not feel a particle of hap-

piness, unless I can know and embrace the religion which can save my soul. I beg that you will take the trouble to enlighten me with the doctrines of your religion; and I will certainly embrace it, if I find it consistent with truth. I beg you also to supply me with such books from which I can be able to know the doctrines of your religion. I shall be happy to pay whatever their prices may be. With best regard, I beg to remain, reverend sir,

Your obedient servant,

PURNO CHAUDRA MUKEYEE,

Commissariat Agent.

I have a continual influx of letters of this sort, and can hardly find time to correspond as I would with the writers. DALL.

SAWYER'S FIRST GOSPEL.

DEAR BROTHER CLARKE, — It is not a light task to abandon the assumptions of ages in the interpretation of the Scriptures, and accept only the lessons which they teach. New and unusual judgments are received slowly and with difficulty. Many have their minds so pre-occupied with generally accepted opinions, that they seem to be incapable of receiving a new truth which is not in harmony with them. Jesus had trial of this perverseness and impotence of the human understanding in his day, and his followers have had continual trial of it since. We cannot expect men to be reasonable who are devoted to the support of delusions. Reason and truth go together, and the untrue is always unreasonable. The most that a discoverer can do is to indicate the positions of his newly discovered objects, and leave men to find them by patient search, or to continue ignorant. Many will not take the trouble to verify

new discoveries in religion: if *any* will, something is gained, and love's labor is not entirely lost. My work on the first Gospel is a book of discovery, and indicates positions where some precious and costly pearls of religious knowledge have long been buried from human sight. Those who examine after me will find them, and be amply compensated for their expense and trouble. The notice of my work in the "Monthly Journal" for June adds but little of importance to the title. It contains, however, some statements to which I beg leave to make exceptions.

I. "Henceforth, it seems, we are to regard Mark's Gospel as the first (in order of time), chiefly because Matthew's Gospel contains additions which would naturally have been added to the subsequent Gospel. But suppose that Matthew's and Mark's were composed independently of each other, and that neither knew of the other's Gospel."

The supposition that these two Gospels were produced independently of each other is inadmissible. They are not independent works: the Gospel according to Mark is copied and followed almost entire in that according to Matthew. This appears clearly from a comparison of the Greek originals. There is not a case in ancient or modern times in which such similarity belongs to independent works: it cannot belong to them.

The previous part of the statement does no justice to my argument; which examines the three possible hypotheses, and decides, according to evidence, in favor of the priority of the book according to Mark. The hypothesis of an independent origin of the books is not possible, and is without a precedent or parallel in the annals of literature.

II. "Papias, who tells us all we know about it, says that Mark's Gospel contains the substance of Peter's discourses, which were chiefly accounts of facts in the life of

Jesus, of which he was a witness." This statement of Papias wants confirmation, and is inconsistent with facts. There is not a word in the book which demands such an origin. The book has not the form of reports of Peter's discourses, and demands no credit from the supposed authority of Peter. The reporters of Henry Ward Beecher's discourses give them as Henry Ward Beecher's; and, if the Gospel according to Mark is a report of Peter's discourses, it ought to have been accredited to him. Reports of Henry Ward Beecher's discourses continually remind us of the author: the Gospel according to Mark never refers us to Peter as having any connection with the book.

III. "In short, we consider the question, whether Matthew or Mark wrote first, to remain uncertain, just as it was before Mr. Sawyer wrote this book. It is not worth while yet to change the order of the Gospels in the New Testament."

Had this bit of dogmatism been put forth in any other connection than in a critical notice of the book, it might have been allowed to pass unchallenged for what it is worth; but, as part of a critical notice, it is of some consequence that it should be just and reasonable. Mr. Sawyer sustains his position by an argument, which, if correct, establishes it, and puts an end to controversy: what fault has the critic to find with that argument? Mr. Sawyer points out a method of settling the question, and invites men to put it to the proof: why has not the critic done so, and reported the result? This dogmatic disposition of books is not the method of legitimate criticism and true science, and is unworthy of a Christian critic. If Mr. Sawyer is mistaken, it belongs to the critic to pronounce him so, only after having demonstrated his short-comings. He cannot be allowed to assume them without proof.

IV. The critic speaks of Mr. Sawyer's supposed shortcomings in regard to the Gospels of Mark and Matthew, as if *he* found such books in the New Testament. In his earlier life, he did; and, but for the stupidity of his critics waking him up to a more thorough examination of biblical questions than he had before made, he might yet have been in that delusion. But *his* first Gospel is not a Gospel *of* Mark; nor is the second one *of* Matthew: *of* Mark and *according to* Mark are very different formulas, and signify different things. In being called "according to Mark," "according to Matthew," &c., these books appear not to have been received, in the earliest times, as books *of* those authorities: *according to* properly expresses agreement, and precludes authorship. This is argued in the book: let the conclusion be admitted, or the argument refuted.

V. Mr. Sawyer's work is not confined to a consideration of the topics noted by the critic. It considers the language, age, and country of the first Gospel; the language of Jesus and his school; poetic and fictitious documents of the first Gospel, and its historic defects; the religion of Jesus as understood by Eusebius in the times of the Council of Nice and of Constantine the Great; the morality of Jesus, his theology, and his church. The method of the author is that of science: it is the same that is applied, with the consent of Christendom, to all secular subjects, and is used by the author with the utmost confidence and freedom. It invites scrutiny, and defies detraction. Nothing is assumed without proof; nothing is pretended to be received or taught by authority; nor is evidence of any kind ever disparaged or trifled with. The author asks as little respect for his opinions as he concedes to those of others. Knowledge is not a matter of opinion.

VI. The author considers the results which he has reached of infinite importance to mankind, and begs that

they may be thoroughly examined and well considered. The ministers of God are not obliged to wait for the concurrence of majorities, even among the learned, in order to be themselves confident of the truths they receive. Jesus knew as well the beneficent character of his religion, before he had made the first convert, as he knows it now, after the lapse of more than eighteen centuries. His humblest disciple is allowed to have the certainty of absolute knowledge, and to follow Jesus with a faith and confidence that the opposition of millions cannot shake, nor their concurrence strengthen. Opinion and assumption rest on authority: knowledge rests on evidence. From the first moment of its birth in the human soul, it is a child of the Supreme, and lives from its own imperishable nature. It cannot die: it has no element of dissolution or decay. It is like time, space, and the Supreme, and is co-ordinate with them. Knowledge is absolute and indestructible, unless the mind decays. Its exercises may be suspended by sleep, and superseded by attention to other things; but they cannot be reversed. There is no arrogance in asserting unacknowledged truths; nor is there any hazard in asserting them. They will amply vindicate their assertion in time, and fully justify their defenders.

Yours most truly,

LEICESTER A. SAWYER.

REMARKS ON MR. SAWYER'S LETTER.

We add a few remarks to Mr. Sawyer's letter.

It is quite true, as Mr. Sawyer suggests, that new opinions are apt to be opposed; but it does not follow that all opinions so opposed are true. Great discoveries are received at first with criticisms and objections; but we must

not infer that every thing which is received with criticism is therefore a great discovery. No doubt, Mr. Sawyer has a right to console himself, when his "First Gospel" is found fault with, that Jesus and the apostles were also found fault with: but this should be for his own private encouragement; it does not bear on the main question. We willingly grant him, without argument, that new truths find it hard to make their way against popular prejudice, provided *he* will also grant, that an opinion which finds it hard to make its way may be an error, and not a truth. We have not objected to his book on the ground of its novelty: we have objected to it because we think it a hasty, superficial, prosaic, and dogmatic treatment of the subject.

Considering what Mr. Sawyer is trying to do, it would be very curious if he were *not* criticised. His mode of treating the New Testament makes it a wholly unhistorical document. Any other history treated in the same way would cease to have any value as history. If a man should go through Xenophon, Thucydides, Tacitus, as Mr. Sawyer goes through the New Testament, saying of any statement which did not suit his notions, "This appears to be a fiction," "This is manifestly fictitious," &c., what value would remain to these works as history, after such a treatment? But the faith of Christendom rests on the New Testament. He, therefore, who pulls the New Testament to pieces in Mr. Sawyer's style of criticism, must not wonder at meeting a little opposition.

The chief objection to such books as Mr. Sawyer's is, that it throws discredit on all liberal criticism. The criticism which is seeking to separate the true from the false in the Bible may well pray to be saved from such friends as this. Every such book as Mr. Sawyer's puts back the cause of rational Christianity, by making the latter seem

responsible for such prosaic and superficial statements as are contained in Mr. Sawyer's "Mark."

We will give a few illustrations of Mr. Sawyer's treatment of the New Testament, with few comments; for comment is unnecessary, and we have no room for more. These extracts are taken from what he calls "Critical Introduction."

Page 51. — He says of Jesus, "His healings seem to place him in the rank of physicians; and the great number and extraordinary character of his cures entitle him to be considered a physician of great skill and diligence."

He adds, that "the Greeks had made some progress in medicine at that time; and an application of their best methods, &c., may have been deemed miraculous."

He therefore supposes Jesus to have been a Jewish physician, who treated diseases after the Greek method. Hence the stories in the Gospels, and hence the faith of mankind (including the Greeks themselves) in his miraculous character.

But, on page 51, Mr. Sawyer also says, "His principal methods of cure are words addressed to the patients." This, it is to be inferred, was the "Greek method of cure," according to Mr. Sawyer. But this was *not* the Greek method of cure. Hippocrates, for example, treated disease by diet, by violent purgatives, by bleeding, and by diuretic and sudorific medicines. His followers, both of the dogmatic and empiric schools of medicine, used similar methods; but we have yet to see the first account of any Greek physicians "whose principal methods were words addressed to the patients."

Mr. Sawyer therefore begins by saying, that Jesus was a physician whose cures were performed by methods borrowed from Greek medicine; and, in the same page, states that the chief methods of cure practised by him

were those of which we have no account as having existed among the Greeks.

This example of what seems to us rather a superficial method of argument is from the very first page of his criticism. We venture to say, after looking through nearly all the book, that it is a fair average of the errors in the hundred and twenty-three pages.

Page 54 is an illustration of the sweeping dogmatism of Mr. Sawyer; by which he contrives, in a single sentence, to set aside (without a word of argument or proof) the belief of all the Trinitarian and all the anti-Trinitarian critics of the Bible. He says that the "first three Gospels make Jesus a man: the fourth makes him a God. The first three never make him preach himself more than man: the fourth often makes him claim a superhuman character," &c. All Trinitarians would deny one clause of this sentence, and all Unitarians would deny the other. Mr. Sawyer may nevertheless be right in his assertion; but a man who sprinkles every page of his book with assertions which are equally opposed to all Orthodox and all liberal criticism should at least not wonder that his book is not generally accepted without some opposition.

Page 57 is an example of Mr. Sawyer's hasty inferences. He says, that, because Mark's Gospel does not contain some important facts contained in Matthew, therefore Mark's must be the original, and Matthew's the copy. The single omission of the supernatural conception of Jesus, he says, proves that Mark could never have heard of such an incident. "It is impossible: he could not have been aware of such an incident." But Mark may have been aware of it, but may not have told it; because, —

1. He may have wished only to relate the facts of *Christ's ministry.*

2. He may have wished to relate only what he heard *from Peter himself.*

3. He may have had some special reason for not relating this incident, *on account of the persons for whom the Gospel was written.* And so on. A dozen reasons there might be beside that which Mr. Sawyer says is the only possible one.

Page 59. — Mr. Sawyer speaks of a "Trinitarian baptismal formula" in Matthew; but he is enough of a theologian to know that the mention of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, in the same sentence, *does not* make it a "Trinitarian formula." Unitarians, he knows, use this formula in the baptismal service just as the Trinitarians do. Therefore this remark is another example of his carelessness.

Page 59. — He says, "The declaration of John, that one was to follow him who would baptize with the Holy Spirit, is supplemented by the addition of fire; making the baptizer the author of rain, accompanied with thunder and lightning, — in the Scriptures, the usual fire from heaven."

The absurd and prosaic character of this interpretation would argue stupidity in its author, were it not rather another illustration of his habit of saying any thing which comes into his head, without stopping to reflect upon it. "Baptize with fire," in Mr. Sawyer's opinion, means to *baptize with thunder and lightning!* and also, somehow or other, it means that the baptizer "is the author of rain." The force of exegesis can hardly go further than this.

Mr. Sawyer imagines that he has discovered that the phrase "Gospel *according to* Mark," &c., does not mean *written by* Mark. "Gospel according to Mark does not mean of or by Mark as an author." The preposition *kata*, he maintains, cannot have this meaning. We had supposed, hitherto, that Mr. Sawyer's knowledge of Greek was accurate; but the slightest examination showed us, that here, as in so many other matters, he is not to be relied on. *Kata*, in both classic and Hellenic Greek, *does*

denote authorship. 2 Maccabees, ii. 13, we have "the writings and commentaries of Nehemiah;" in the LXX., κατὰ τὸν Νεεμίαν. We suppose that Mr. Sawyer would admit that the preposition κατὰ is here used for authorship. SCHLEUSNER, in his Lexicon to the LXX., gives this as a parallel to "according to Matthew," and says that both denote authorship. Schleusner's familiarity with the idioms of Jewish Greek adds no small weight to his opinion.

DONNEGAN, Greek Lexicon, gives the meaning of authorship in classic Greek, in the instance of καθ' Ἡροδοτον, referring to something in the history of Herodotus. The meaning is not of something which agrees with Herodotus, or is in congruity with him, but something which he said himself.

So, in taking up Lucian, and opening it at random, we meet (Charon, *sive* Contemplantes) with the phrase κατὰ τὸν Ὁμηρον, quoting a verse of which Homer was the author.

When, therefore, Mr. Sawyer says (p. 62), that, in such phrases, *kata* "signifies agreement," and adds, "but it never signifies authorship," he shows that his Greek is as unreliable as his reasoning.

After writing this, we turned to De Wette's Introduction to the New Testament, and found (§ 78) four instances in which κατὰ denotes authorship, and three in which it only denotes agreement. De Wette adds, that "the opinion of all antiquity attests the commonly accepted sense;" i.e., of authorship. What shall we say of Mr. Sawyer's Greek, when he declares, in the face of this evidence, that this preposition "never signifies authorship"? Olshausen, speaking of the force of κατὰ here, says that the phrase "Gospel of Jesus," in common use, prevented the use of "Gospel of Matthew."

Turning to §§ 94, *et seq.*, in De Wette, we find a thorough examination and refutation of Mr. Sawyer's theory, that Mark wrote before Matthew and Luke. After reading it, one may possibly still think Mr. Sawyer correct; but no one will ever justify him in the positive and peremptory tone in which he maintains it in face of such an argument.

Mr. Sawyer's declaration (p. 65), that "assertions of authorships by books are never to be received without proof," needed some explanation before he went on to add, that the man who assumes authorship without evidence "*ought* to be deceived." What does he mean by "assertion of authorship by books"? All that we know of the authorship of the works of Virgil, Cicero, Horace, Dante, Tasso, Shakspeare, and Milton, is that the books themselves assert or indicate their writers, and that books written by others afterward confirm these statements. This is just the way in which we know the writers of the books of the Bible.

The want of critical judgment in Mr. Sawyer is strikingly shown in his opinion that Peter and his followers were opposed to Jewish ceremonies, and that Paul and his followers supported them (p. 75). Peter, he thinks, was the radical, and Paul the conservative. Peter was for utterly destroying Judaism; Paul, for preserving a good deal of it. Paul was a ceremonialist, and Peter for abolishing all ceremonies.

This is very much as if some future critic should describe the Unitarian controversy in New England by saying, "Dr. Beecher, Moses Stuart, and the Andover School, denied the Trinity: Dr. Channing and Andrews Norton defended it. Theodore Parker sided with Abner Kneeland in maintaining the five points of Calvinism, in opposition to the destructive radicalism of Dr. Mason of New York, and Dr. Tyler of Connecticut."

Our friend gets a little prosy when he has occasion to speak of the prophecies of Christ's coming "in the clouds, and with great glory." He cannot see the symbolism of all this, and sō takes pains to tell us that the stars have never fallen, nor the moon's light been withdrawn," &c. This reminds us of Dr. Johnson explaining Milton, or of Sydney Smith's Scotchman trying to understand a joke, but incapable of getting it into his head, unless, says the English humorist, "by means of a surgical operation." It would take more than a surgical operation to enable Mr. Sawyer to see the poetry of all these noble images. He takes it all *à pied du lettre;* and, because no literal trumpet has been blown in the air, declares the prophecy of Christ's second coming to have remained unfulfilled. "Jesus," says he, "is made to describe his coming in the clouds in the most definite terms. Nothing is doubtful or ambiguous, and no chance is provided for retreat or equivocation."

Mr. Sawyer seems to have composed his work for some class of readers of very limited information, if we may judge from the kind of instruction he occasionally imparts. Thus (p. 73), *à propos* of the remark in the book of Acts concerning the three thousand souls baptized on the day of Pentecost, Mr. Sawyer tells us, "Souls are not capable of baptism." Page 76, when opposing religious ablutions, or washing for religious purposes, he gently and gravely declares, that "washing for cleanliness is very well"! Directly he goes further, and adds the important piece of information, that "washing for health" is also not only allowable, but is indeed quite a duty. Page 113, our author, having told us that Jesus was a carpenter, says, that "to what branches of this trade he devoted his great abilities, we are not informed." In another part of the book he makes him a physician, who had studied Greek medicine

in Alexandria, and who lived by fees derived from healing and teaching; for it seems he was also a professional teacher. Elsewhere he makes him a learned philologian, who had studied language very diligently, and, by means of words carefully learned, was enabled to reason profoundly and comprehensively. Mr. Sawyer's opinion seems to be slightly different on this point in different parts of his book; though he is, of course, equally positive and determined in each place. Jesus kept school, and taught Greek, and made himself acquainted with Greek poets, philosophers, dramatists, and historians (p. 119). Jesus was a carpenter, and perhaps an architect (p. 113), and "devoted his great abilities" to this pursuit, for how long we do not know. Jesus "lived on the proceeds of his profession as a healer and teacher" (p. 137).

Page 118. — "The Greek language was the result of accurate observations and reasonings."

No philosophical student of language ever maintains such a view as this. Languages are not made: they grow. They are not "the result of reasoning:" they come without the thought or will of man.

We have thus noticed a few of the instances of hasty opinions and rash conclusions which have occurred to us in turning over the pages of this book. It has not been a pleasant task; for we respect the good will and honest industry of Mr. Sawyer. If he had been willing to leave our previous notice unanswered, we should have said no more about his book; but, as he informed us that he preferred to have his article in this number inserted with our comments, we have thus endeavored to support, by a few proofs, our previous assertions concerning the incompetency of Mr. Sawyer as a biblical critic.

A NEW UNITARIAN SOCIETY.

We attended lately the installation of Rev. John A. Buckingham as minister of the Unitarian Congregational Society of Sturbridge, Mass. This is a new society, just introduced into the ranks of our denomination by this service. Its members, until recently, were associated with one of the largest Calvinistic societies in the Commonwealth; but, after enduring that form of religious ministration as long as their intelligence and patience would permit, they determined last spring to abandon their old associations, and set up a tabernacle for themselves, and provide a method of worship and religious culture in accordance with their growing intelligence. This they did without any instigation from abroad. No agent or missionary had been among them to sow the seeds of heresy, or create dissatisfaction with the popular belief; but the old system had worn itself out. It failed any longer to meet the claims of manly and womanly intelligence, or to satisfy the longings of a rational piety. A large number of the old society, sufficient to constitute a respectable congregation of themselves, united together spontaneously in seeking a minister of a different order; and this is the result of the movement.

For the last four months, our brother has been among them; during which time, the new society has been legally organized, and compacted together, and has now formally installed him as its minister. For the present, the place of gathering on the Sunday will be the Agricultural Hall, — a large building eligibly situated in the centre of the town, and capable of accommodating from three to four hundred people. The average attendance is larger than in most of our country parishes; for Sturbridge is an old-

fashioned place, and the practice of attending "meeting" has not yet become obsolete. There is every prospect that the new society will not only sustain itself, but become, ere long, the dominant society of the town. The elements composing it are sound and healthful; and the method thus far pursued has been of a character to satisfy the intelligence of the people, without stirring up strife, or creating mere sectarian alienation. In fact, the growth of this society, from the beginning, has offered not the slightest excuse for bigotry to raise a prejudice against it; and we have heard of no manifestation but that of wonder, on the part of those who have stood aloof, that it should have been initiated so quietly, and have gone on so effectively to its present condition, without opposition and without abatement.

We hail the rise of this new society as only the beginning of what we may expect to see and hear in other quarters; for we are persuaded, that in spite of the zeal of sectarists, and their endeavor to retain the old methods of thought and discipline in our New-England churches, there is a deep under-current of dissent gradually working its way to the surface, that will eventually submerge the old theology and its cognate systems of ministration. It is not mere uneasy radicalism nor an indefinable rationalism that is sapping the foundations of the popular creeds, though much of these has been aroused by the persistent advocacy of a rigid Calvinism: but the common mind has been gradually working itself free from the influence of superstition and priestcraft, which has produced only a seeming loyalty without any hearty discipleship; and it only waits the favorable opportunity to declare its emancipation as in the present instance, when the old associations will be superseded. It is not the work of denominationalism, though it may finally take on that form;

but it is the result of natural causes. There will be a disintegration, as there was formerly in the Congregational body, yet without the personal alienation and the bitter animosity that then ensued, and which has not in every instance wholly subsided to this day. There are unmistakable signs of progress in the churches as in the State. They thrust themselves upon our notice; nor can any prevent the fact. As one of our eloquent brethren has said, we cannot prevent the rising of the orb of day: it will overtop the walls of our conventicles, and, ascending, will spread its beams above the highest mountain.

Do not, as some do, look on the child as born under the curse of God; as naturally hostile to all goodness and truth. What! the child totally depraved? Can it be that such a thought ever entered the mind of a human being, especially of a parent? What! in the beauty of childhood and youth, in that open brow, that cheerful smile, do you see the brand of total corruption? Is it a little fiend who sleeps so sweetly on his mother's breast? Was it an infant demon which Jesus took in his arms, and said, "Of such is the kingdom of heaven"? Is the child, who, as you relate to him a story of suffering or generosity, listens with a tearful or kindling eye and a throbbing heart, — is *he* a child of hell? As soon could I look on the sun, and think it the source of darkness, as on the countenance of childhood and youth, and see total depravity written there. —*Channing.*

Men who, to support a creed, would shake our trust in the calm, deliberate, and distinct decisions of our rational and moral powers, endanger religion more than its open foes, and forge the deadliest weapon for the infidel. —*Ibid.*

MEETINGS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

Aug. 15. — Present, Messrs. Stebbins, Livermore, Clarke, Brigham, Barrett, Hinckley, Lowe, Heywood, Sawyer, Smith, and Fox.

After a statement from the Treasurer concerning the increased expense of the India Mission, resulting from the high rate of exchange, it was voted, that the Committee on the India Mission be directed to consider, and report at the October meeting, whether it is expedient to take any, and, if any, what action, under the vote of the Board, passed Feb. 9, 1863.

The Special Committee, to whom was referred, at the last meeting, the subject of the President's missionary tour, stated that they at once decided to report in favor of the plan, but had since received information from the Western members of the Executive Committee, which led to a change of opinion. The people at the West would be so thoroughly engrossed, the coming fall, by the draft and the presidential election, that it seemed expedient to postpone the proposed tour until a more favorable season.

The Committee on Publications reported, that, to meet an immediate and urgent demand, they had printed 30,000 of the hospital tracts of the "Army Series," and 2,000 copies of "The Soldier's Companion;" also that they had ordered 14,000 of other tracts in the "Army Series," of which the supply was entirely exhausted. This action of the Committee was unanimously approved; and authority was given to them to issue, when needed, new editions of any of the Army Tracts, so as to keep a supply always on hand.

This Committee were further authorized to publish, as

No. 19 of the "Army Series," a tract by Rev. John F. W. Ware, entitled "Rally on the Reserve."

Authority was granted to the Committee on Publications to distribute among the soldiers any of the publications of the Association suited to the purpose.

After the transaction of other business, the Board adjourned to Monday, Sept. 12.

Sept. 12. — Present, Messrs. Stebbins, Livermore, Hedge, Clarke, Barrett, Hinckley, Ware, Lowe, Heywood, Sawyer, Smith, and Fox.

The Committee on New-England Correspondence stated that applications for aid had been received from the societies at Groton Junction and Sudbury, Mass.; upon which they were not, as yet, prepared to report.

The Committee on Western Correspondence reported, on an application for aid from the society in Lawrence, Kan., in favor of adopting the following arrangement, proposed by Mr. Staples in behalf of the Western Conference: The Association to appropriate to the society a certain sum towards the salary of their minister for one year, should a suitable man be found for the place; with the understanding that the Conference give an equal amount for the same purpose. They also reported in favor of a plan proposed by Mr. Staples, to aid in supporting a minister for a year at Fond du Lac, Wis., — the Western Conference and the Association to appropriate for this object $50 each. Both of these reports were adopted.

This Committee also presented an application from the society in Washington for $100, to meet expenses incurred in supplying their pulpit during the last session of Congress, while their pastor was acting as Chaplain of the House of Representatives; and, in accordance with the recommendation of the Committee, the sum asked for was granted.

The Committee on Aid to Theological Students presented applications for aid from the Perkins Fund, from six students connected with the Cambridge Divinity School; and it was voted to appropriate to each of these applicants the sum asked for, — $50; and to students at the Meadville Theological School, $130, on account of the unexpended income for 1863; and $170 on account of the income for the current year, to be distributed by President Livermore in such way as might seem to him best.

The Committee on Publications reported that Mr. Ware's Army Tract, referred to them at the last meeting, had received their hearty approval, and was now in the hands of the printer.

The Army-Mission Committee reported that Mr. Calvin Stebbins had just returned from his visit to the hospitals in Washington and vicinity, having accomplished there a most excellent work; and also that Rev. Fred. W. Holland, while at Washington recently, had offered to visit City Point, to distribute the army publications, if the Association would pay his expenses there and back from Washington; which offer they had accepted. This action of the Committee was approved.

This Committee also presented a letter from Rev. Jas. Eastwood, a Universalist clergyman just appointed by the Massachusetts Universalist Convention as their missionary at City Point, which suggested the appointment by the Association of a missionary to labor with him in that field, and explained the great advantages to be derived from such an arrangement. It was then voted, on the recommendation of the Committee, to appoint Mr. Calvin Stebbins the missionary of the Association at City Point for three months.

After some discussion concerning the financial condition of the Association, and the great need of funds, the Presi-

dent was requested to prepare an appeal for aid, to be sent to all the societies of the denomination.

It was then voted to appoint a Committee of three to report some plan for increasing the usefulness of the Association; and they were authorized, should they deem it expedient, to call a special meeting of the Board.

It was suggested, that, on account of the great increase in the cost of publishing the "Monthly Journal," it would be well to require life and annual members and subscribers to pay their own postage; and the subject was referred to the Finance Committee, with full powers.

The Board then adjourned to Monday, Oct. 10.

INTELLIGENCE.

The new Unitarian Church in Houlton, Me., was dedicated on Thursday, Aug. 25. The order of services was as follows: Introductory prayer by Rev. Richard M. Hodges, of Cambridge, Mass.; reading of the Scriptures by Rev. Jacob Caldwell, of Calais, Me.; dedicatory prayer by Rev. Joshua A. Swan, of Kennebunk, Me.; sermon by Rev. Charles C. Everett, of Bangor, Me.

Mr. George F. Piper, having accepted an invitation to take charge of the society in Houlton, Me., for three months, was ordained to the work of the Christian ministry, at the Indiana-place Church, Boston, on Sunday evening, Aug. 28. The order of services was as follows: Voluntary; introductory prayer, and reading of the Scriptures, by Rev. Ezra S. Gannett, D.D., of Boston; hymn; sermon by Rev. Thomas Hill, D.D., of Cambridge; ordaining prayer by Rev. William P. Tilden, of Boston; charge by Rev. James Freeman Clarke, of Boston; right hand of fellowship by Rev. T. B. Forbush, of West Roxbury; benediction by Mr. Piper.

Mr. Francis E. Abbot was ordained as pastor of the society in Dover, N.H., on Wednesday, Aug. 31. The order of services was as follows: Voluntary; introductory prayer by Rev. James De Normandie, of Portsmouth, N.H.; reading of Scriptures by Rev. Henry W. Foote, of Boston; hymn, read by Rev. J. L. Hatch, of Concord, N.H.; sermon by Rev. James Freeman Clarke, of Boston; hymn, read by Rev. A. W. Stevens, of Manchester, N.H.; ordaining prayer by Rev. Thomas J. Mumford, of Dorchester, Mass.; charge by Rev. Edward E. Hale, of Boston; right hand of fellowship by Rev. George L. Chaney, of Boston; address to the people by Rev. William P. Tilden, of Boston; closing prayer by Rev. Henry W. Foote; anthem; benediction by the pastor.

Rev. Thomas W. Brown was installed as pastor of the society in Sandwich, Mass., on Tuesday, Sept. 13. The order of services was as follows: Voluntary; anthem; invocation by Rev. Thomas Weston, of Barnstable; reading of the Scriptures by Rev. J. C. Paine (Orthodox), of Sandwich; hymn, read by Rev. William T. Worth (Methodist), of Sandwich; sermon by Rev. Andrew P. Peabody, D.D., of Cambridge; installing prayer by Rev. Warren H. Cudworth, of East Boston; hymn; charge by Rev. Leonard J. Livermore, of Lexington; fellowship of the churches by Rev. Charles Lowe, of Somerville; concluding prayer by Rev. C. Y. De Normandie, of Fairhaven; benediction by the pastor.

Rev. John A. Buckingham was installed as pastor of the new Unitarian Society in Sturbridge, Mass., on Thursday, Sept. 15. The order of services was as follows: Voluntary by the choir; introductory prayer, and reading of the Scriptures, by Rev. A. B. Hervey (Universalist), of Southbridge; hymn; sermon by Rev. Edward E. Hale, of Boston; prayer of installation by Rev. Alonzo Hill, D.D., of Worcester; chant; right hand of fellowship by Rev. Rush R. Shippen, of Worcester; anthem; benediction by the pastor.

Mr. David H. Montgomery, a graduate of the Cambridge Divinity School in the class of 1863, was ordained as pastor of the society in South Danvers, Mass., on Thursday, Sept. 15.

The order of services was as follows: Voluntary; reading from the Scriptures by Rev. Sidney H. Morse, of Cincinnati, O.; hymn; sermon by Rev. George W. Briggs, D.D., of Salem; hymn; ordaining prayer by Rev. Joseph B. Marvin, of Cambridge; charge, and address to the people, by Rev. Edmund B. Willson, of Salem; right hand of fellowship by Rev. Augustus M. Haskell, of Salem; hymn; benediction by the pastor.

Rev. SAMUEL R. CALTHROP, of Marblehead, has accepted an invitation to preach for the Twenty-eighth Congregational Society, Boston, until January next.

Mr. JOHN W. CHADWICK, a graduate of the Cambridge Divinity School in the class of the present year, has accepted an invitation to supply the pulpit of the Second Unitarian Society in Brooklyn, N.Y., for three months.

Mr. AARON PORTER, a graduate of the Meadville Theological School in the class of the present year, has accepted a call from the "Christian" Society in Lewisburg, Penn.

Rev. FREDERIC FROTHINGHAM has received a call from the society in Brattleborough, Vt.

Rev. HENRY F. HARRINGTON has accepted an invitation to resume the charge of the Lee-street Society, Cambridgeport, Mass.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.

1864.			
Aug. 31.	From	Rev. Joshua Young's Society, Hingham, as a donation	$40.00
Sept. 3.	„	Rev. F. A. Farley, D.D., trustee, as income of Graham Fund	289.78
„ „	„	Rev. Thomas J. Mumford's Society, Dorchester, for Monthly Journals	11.00
„ 12.	„	Society in Grafton, for Monthly Journals	12.00
„ 13.		Rev. J. H. Wiggin, as a donation	1.00
„ 16.	„	Society in Canton, as a donation	32.00
„ „	„	Rev. William Silsbee, as an annual membership	1.00
„ 19.	„	Rev. Joshua Young's Society, Hingham, for Monthly Journals, additional	6.00
„ 21.	„	Society in Barre, as a donation	28.25
„ „	„	J. R. Appleton, Dublin, N.H., as a donation,	5.00